



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/098,366 06/17/98 HIGASHIYAMA

N 13237-2150

EXAMINER

TM02/1128

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
BRENDA O HOLMES
2400 MONARCH TOWER
3424 PEACHTREE ROAD N E
ATLANTA GA 30326

RASHORE, W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED:

11/28/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

le

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/098,366

Applicant(s)
Higashiyama et al.

Examiner
William L. Bashore

Group Art Unit
2176



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 24, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 10/24/2000 to the original Application filed on 6/17/1998. Examiner acknowledges amendment after final filed on 9/25/2000.
2. The rejection of claims 1, 3-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter and Gipson has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. Claims 1, 3-20 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 10, 15 are independent claims.

RCE UNDER 37 CFR 1.114 AFTER FINAL REJECTION

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on **9/25/2000** has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2176

6. **Claims 1, 3-6, 10-15, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter, U.S. Patent No. 5,857,212 issued January 1999, in view of Fukunaga, U.S. Patent No. 5,627,948 issued May 1997.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim 1(a) *“determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text”*).

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with amended claim 1(b) *“collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text”*).

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with amended claim 1(b) *“otherwise, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor”*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga’s taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Art Unit: 2176

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with amended claim 1(c) “*selecting one of a plurality of rules based on the collected context information*”).

Van De Vanter teaches changing cursor presentation (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67; compare with amended claim 1(d) “*in response to selecting the rule, changing a presentation of the cursor to indicate an anticipated location of the insertion point...*”). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach indication of formatting types in close proximity. However, Fukunaga teaches display of formatting information proximate to cursor location, subsequent to a change in said cursor location (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim 1(d) “*...and a type of formatting that will be applied to text and objects located in close proximity to the cursor location*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga’s taught advantage of format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches the use of cursor movement and placement management (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim 1(e) “*determining whether an indication has been received to place the insertion point in the electronic document*”).

Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby a cursor is positioned in a displayed program for editing purposes (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 58-63). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach performing formatting. However, Fukunaga teaches performing formatting relative to cursor placement (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim 1(f) “*if so, then performing formatting to place the insertion point in the electronic document*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga’s taught advantage of

Art Unit: 2176

format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Van De Vanter teaches various types of mouse clicks that can be used in the embodiment of the invention as disclosed by Van De Vanter (Van De Vanter column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach the repeating of steps 1(a) - 1(f) of amended claim 1 upon no indication of cursor placement. However, Van De Vanter teaches repeating the visual offset calculation of alignment markers (Van De Vanter abstract at bottom, also column 42 lines 54-57; compare with claim 4). Claim 4 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because of Van De Vanter's taught advantage of repetition, providing a way to display a complete formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of formatting comprising the addition/deletion of document formatting properties. However, Fukunaga teaches the changing of format properties (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4, also column 4 lines 8-10; compare with amended claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Fukunaga to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Fukunaga's taught advantage of format changing, providing increased textual correctness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 6, Van De Vanter teaches localized lexical analysis performed subsequent to an insertion point defining a position of user editing, said position indicated by a cursor over text (Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-33, column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim 6).

In regard to independent claim 10, Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim 10(a) *“determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text”*).

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with amended claim 10(b) *“collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text”*).

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with amended claim 10(b) *“otherwise, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor”*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga’s taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with amended claim 10(c) *“applying the*

Art Unit: 2176

collected context information...", and "*...to determine whether the collected information coincides with one of the plurality of rules*"). Van De Vanter also teaches the use of a database for storing lexical rules (see Van De Vanter column 11 lines 54-57; compare with amended claim 10(c) "*...to a database of a plurality of rules...*").

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of cursor selection and display based upon insertion point position resulting in different editing behaviors and cursor presentations (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67, column 37 lines 1-2; compare with amended claim 10(d) "*if so, then determining one of a plurality of cursors associated with the coinciding rule*", and 10(e) "*displaying the associated cursor*").

In regard to dependent claim 11, Van De Vanter teaches the presentation of an I-beam cursor based upon the position of an insertion point in the document (Van De Vanter column 37 lines 19-24; compare with claim 11).

In regard to dependent claim 12, Van De Vanter teaches a method of alignment markers placed around tokens for centering lines, and automatic aligning between lines (Van De Vanter column 39 lines 9-23; compare with claim 12).

In regard to dependent claim 13, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach the repeating of steps 10(a) - 10(e) of amended claim 10 upon movement of cursor placement. However, Van De Vanter teaches repeating the visual offset calculation of alignment markers (Van De Vanter abstract at bottom, also column 42 lines 54-57; compare with claim 13). Claim 13 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because of Van De Vanter's taught

Art Unit: 2176

advantage of repetition, providing a way to display a complete formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 13, and is rejected using the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 15, Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim 15(a) *“determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text”*).

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with amended claim 15(b) *“collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text”*).

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with amended claim 15(b) *“otherwise, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor”*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga’s taught advantage

Art Unit: 2176

of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with amended claim **15(c)** “*applying the collected context information...*”, and “*...to determine whether the collected information coincides with one of the plurality of rules*”). Van De Vanter also teaches the use of a database for storing lexical rules (Van De Vanter column 11 lines 54-57; compare with amended claim **15(c)** “*...to a database of a plurality of rules...*”).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of matching an I-beam cursor relevant to various insertion point positions (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 64-67, column 37 lines 1-3; compare with amended claim **15(d)** “*if so, then adjusting the location of the insertion point based upon the coinciding rule*”, and **15(e)** “*determining whether the location of the insertion point matches the location of the cursor*”).

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach the repeating of steps 15(a) - 15(e). However, Van De Vanter teaches repeating the visual offset calculation of subsequent alignment markers (Van De Vanter abstract at bottom, also column 42 lines 54-57; compare with amended claim **15(f)** “*if not, then repeating steps (a) - (e)*”). Claim **15(f)** would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because of Van De Vanter’s taught advantage of repetition, providing a way to display a complete formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 19, Van De Vanter teaches a method of a token stream, whereby dynamic user input results in updating insertion points and cursor positions of each dynamic editing action which can be used with a mouse (Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35, column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 19).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Van De Vanter teaches a method of an insertion point defining an actual editing location, said cursor location and analysis is updated subsequent to a user edit (Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35; compare with claim 20).

7. Claims 7-9, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter and Fukunaga as applied to independent claims 1, 15 above, and further in view of Gipson, U.S. Patent No. 5,778,402 issued July 1998.

In regard to dependent claim 7, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of associating a rule with formatting steps, as well as a method for matching context information with a trigger and selecting a corresponding rule. However, Gipson teaches a method whereby rules are associated with, and used to trigger evaluation routines for the ultimate purpose of autocorrecting input (Gipson column 10 lines 9-13, 15-18, 25-30; compare with claim 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of rules based autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness and accuracy to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 8, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of associating a rule with formatting steps, said formatting steps performed with a coinciding rule. However, Gipson teaches a method whereby rules are associated and used to trigger evaluation routines for the ultimate purpose of autocorrecting input, the autocorrecting performing a sequence of steps resulting in replacement of text (see Gipson column 10 lines 9-13, 15-18, 25-30, column 22 lines 4-17; compare with claim 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of rules based autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness and accuracy to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 9, claim 9 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 8, and is rejected using the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 16, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of associating applying formatting properties for adjusting cursor location, said formatting steps performed with a coinciding rule. However, Gipson teaches a method whereby rules are associated and used to trigger evaluation routines for the ultimate purpose of autocorrecting input, the autocorrecting performing a sequence of steps resulting in replacement of text (see Gipson column 10 lines 9-13, 15-18, 25-30, column 22 lines 4-17; compare with claim 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of rules based autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness and accuracy to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 17, Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input, after requesting an update from a structural analyzer (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5, column 35 lines 13-17; compare with claim 17).

In regard to dependent claim 18, claim 18 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 17, and is rejected using the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. **Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.**

Kwatinetz et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,832,528 issued November 1998

Wagner, Annette et al., Drag me, drop me, treat me like an object, ACM Conference on Human Factors and Computing Systems, May 7-11, 1995, pp.525-530.

Art Unit: 2176

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is (703) 308-5807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax number to this art unit is (703) 308-6606.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 305-9724 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

William L. Bashore
11/15/2000


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700